



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,864	03/30/2004	David Sinai	MPI508 151677	3802
65589	7590	08/19/2008	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 S.W. FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			BROWN, MICHAEL J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2116	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/19/2008			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/811,864	Applicant(s) SINAL, DAVID
	Examiner Michael J. Brown	Art Unit 2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 28,32,55 and 58-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 28,32,55 and 58-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

1. Claims 28, 32, 55, and 58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takasaki et al.[Takahashi](US PGPub 2003/0140261) in view of Crouch et al.[Crouch](US Patent 6,970,080) and further in view of Butler, Jr. et al.[Butler](US Patent 5,647,388).

As to claim 28, Takasaki discloses a method comprising providing an operating voltage(reference voltage sources 11 and 12, see Fig. 1) to a processor(CPU 3, see Fig. 1)(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and paragraph 0027, lines 1-2), and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based on a mode of operation(low-rate clock; see paragraph 0024, line 13 and high-rate clock; see paragraph 0027, line 2) of the processor(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and paragraph 0027, lines 1-2).

However Takasaki fails to specifically disclose the processor configured to process wireless signals, and determining an anticipated change in a mode of operation of the processor.

Crouch teaches a processor(computer processor 12, see Fig. 4) configured to process wireless signals(see column 2, lines 32-34 and column 3, lines 16-17).

Butler teaches determining an anticipated change in a mode of operation of a processor(processor 110, see Fig. 1)(see column 3, lines 49-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Crouch's processor which processes wireless signals to Takasaki's method of modifying the operational voltage of the processor based on the clock rate of the processor. It further would have been obvious to apply Butler's method of determining anticipated mode changes to Crouch's processor in order to determine its clock rate. The motivation to do so would be to selectively power down or power up the system upon reception of the wireless signal(see Crouch's Abstract, lines 10-13) ultimately based on a predicted mode of operation of the processor.

As to claim 32, Takasaki discloses the method, wherein the operating voltage is modified by reducing the operating voltage when the current mode of operation is determined to be a sleep mode(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13).

As to claim 33, Takasaki discloses the method, wherein the operating voltage is modified by increasing the operating voltage when the current mode of operation is determined to be an active mode(see paragraph 0027, lines 1-2).

As to claim 55, Takasaki discloses an apparatus comprising a power management controller(control circuit 1, see Fig. 1) to provide an operating voltage(reference voltage sources 11 and 12, see Fig. 1) to a processor(CPU 3, see Fig. 1)(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and paragraph 0027, lines 1-2), and to modify the operating voltage based on a mode of operation(low-rate clock; see paragraph 0024, line 13 and high-rate clock; see paragraph 0027, line 2) of the processor(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and paragraph 0027, lines 1-2). However, Takasaki fails to disclose the processor configured to process wireless communication signals, and Takasaki fails to disclose wherein the power management controller is adapted to determine an anticipated mode of operation of the processor.

Crouch teaches a processor(computer processor 12, see Fig. 4) configured to process wireless communication signals(see column 2, lines 32-34 and column 3, lines 16-17).

Butler teaches a power management controller that is adapted to determine an anticipated mode of operation of a device(processor 110, see Fig. 1)(see column 3, lines 49-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Crouch's processor which processes wireless signals to Takasaki's method of modifying the operational voltage of the processor based on the clock rate of the processor. It further would have been obvious to apply Butler's method of determining anticipated mode changes to Crouch's processor in order to determine its clock rate. The motivation to do so would be to selectively power down or power up

the system upon reception of the wireless signal(see Crouch's Abstract, lines 10-13)
ultimately based on a predicted mode of operation of the processor.

As to claim 58, Takasaki discloses an article of manufacture comprising a storage medium(ROM 30 and EEPROM 31, see Fig. 4), and a set of instructions(program; see paragraph 0039, line 3) stored in the storage medium. Takasaki further discloses the set of instructions when executed by a power management controller(control circuit 1, see Fig. 1) cause the power management controller to perform operations comprising providing an operating voltage(reference voltage sources 11 and 12, see Fig. 1) to a processor(CPU 3, see Fig. 1)(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and paragraph 0027, lines 1-2), and modifying the operating voltage provided to the processor based a mode of operation of the processor(low-rate clock; see paragraph 0024, line 13 and high-rate clock; see paragraph 0027, line 2). However Takasaki fails to specifically disclose the power management controller configured to process wireless signals, and determining an anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor.

Crouch teaches a processor(computer processor 12, see Fig. 4) configured to process wireless signals(see column 2, lines 32-34 and column 3, lines 16-17).

Butler teaches a power management controller that is adapted to determine an anticipated mode of operation of a processor(processor 110, see Fig. 1)(see column 3, lines 49-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Crouch's processor which processes wireless signals to Takasaki's method of modifying the operational voltage of the processor based on the

clock rate of the processor. It further would have been obvious to apply Butler's method of determining anticipated mode changes to Crouch's processor in order to determine its clock rate. The motivation to do so would be to selectively power down or power up the system upon reception of the wireless signal(see Crouch's Abstract, lines 10-13) ultimately based on a predicted mode of operation of the processor.

As to claim 59, Takasaki discloses the article of manufacture, wherein the operating voltage is modified by reducing the operating voltage in response to the signal when the anticipated mode of operation is a sleep mode(see paragraph 0024, lines 11-13).

As to claim 60, Takasaki discloses the article of manufacture, wherein the operating voltage is modified by increasing the operating voltage in response to the signal when the anticipated mode of operation is an active mode(see paragraph 0027, lines 1-2).

As to claim 61, Butler teaches the method in accordance with claim 28, wherein the anticipated change in mode of operation of the processor is determined by sensing a circuit mode of operation(see column 3, lines 44-53).

As to claim 62, Butler teaches the method in accordance with claim 28, wherein the anticipated change in mode of operation of the processor is determined by sending a signal indicative of the current and anticipated mode(see column 3, lines 44-53).

As to claim 63, Butler teaches the method in accordance with claim 28, wherein the anticipated change in mode of operation of the processor is determined by sending

a signal indicative of the anticipated change of mode of operation(see column 3, lines 44-53).

As to claim 64, Takahashi and Butler teach the method in accordance with claim 28, wherein the operating voltage provided to the processor based on the anticipated change in the mode of operation of the processor is modified based on a signal indicative of the anticipated change(see Takahashi paragraph 0024, lines 11-13 and Butler column 3, lines 44-53).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 6/24/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 28, 32-33, 36, 40-41, 44, 48-49, and 52-60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takasaki et al.[Takahashi](US PGPub 2003/0140261) in view of Crouch et al.[Crouch](US Patent 6,970,080) and further in view of Kouropoulos(US Patent 6,961,856) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Takasaki et al.[Takahashi](US PGPub 2003/0140261) in view of Crouch et al.[Crouch](US Patent 6,970,080) and further in view of Butler, Jr. et al.[Butler](US Patent 5,647,388).

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-5932. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571)272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J. Brown
Art Unit 2116

/Thuan N. Du/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2116